Opposing Views Attachment #1

Respected Scientists Reveal the Certainty that Natural Resources in the Forest are Harmed (and some destroyed) by Timber Harvest Activities

Introduction

The following statements describe the natural resources that will most likely sustain damage as a result of timber harvest activities. The majority of the statement are authored or signed by Ph.D. biological scientists. They all describe the natural resources in and downstream from timber sale areas that are significantly degraded and sometimes destroyed by logging activities. After you read each statement ask yourself if the library in your office contains any of the source documents for the statements below. Then ask yourself why.

The population of the United States will double to 636 million in 2088. Wild, undeveloped space will be precious. Will the kids living then appreciate your proposal to sell this timber sale?

Timber Harvest Opposing View #1 - The following document contains pertinent color pictures showing logging damage, thus the article text is not shown here. Please use the link below to access the article.

Al-jabber, Jabber M. "**Habitat Fragmentation:: Effects and Implications"**
Clearcuts and forest fragmentation, Willamette NF, Oregon.
From: Cascadia Wildland Project, Spring 2003
http://faculty.ksu.edu.sa/a/Documents/Habitat%20Fragmentation%20Effects%20and%20Implication.pdf

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #2 - "Timber harvest operations have been shown to have many effects on adjacent watercourses and on the aquatic ecosystems they support. This may occur from introductions or loss of woody debris, loss of riparian vegetation, accelerated stream bank and bed erosion, the alteration of natural channel form and process, and the reduction of stream habitat diversity. However, the existing literature indicates one of the most insidious effects of logging is the elevation of sediment loads and increased sedimentation within the drainage basin.

Sediment generation from various forestry practices has been studied extensively in the past. Forestry practices which generate suspended sediments include all operations that disturb soil surfaces such as site preparations, clear-cutting, log skidding, yarding, slash burns, heavy equipment operation and road construction and maintenance."

Anderson, P.G. 1996. "**Sediment generation from forestry operations and associated effects on aquatic ecosystems**"
Proceedings of the Forest-Fish Conference: Land Management Practices Affecting Aquatic Ecosystems, May 1-4, 1996, Calgary, Alberta.
http://www.alliance-pipeline.com/contentfiles/45 Sediment_generation.pdf

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #3 - "Timber harvest will remove dead and dying material from the site and inhibit the recruitment of downed woody material as time progresses. Timber harvest and associated reduced structural complexity and reduced age and size class diversity are all known to reduce population abundance and diversity of ants and a number of birds. For instance, ants are documented to require downed woody material in a variety of sizes and in all stages of decomposition (*Torgersen and Bull*, 1995). This is an attribute that is negatively correlated with harvest of the dead and dying trees and positively correlated with natural succession, especially after disturbance. Ants and birds are known to predate on insect species which cause

mortality to trees, serving as a potentially important population control in the case of epidemics or before they occur (*Campbell, Torgersen and Srivastava*, 1983). Structural and functional characteristics associated with unlogged forests are also important for canopy arthropods, which play an important role in regulating pest outbreaks (*Schowalter*, 1989).

Structural complexity, functional diversity, diversity of ecological process and diversity of structure in roadless areas are all expected to be less susceptible to the outbreak of pests and regulate insect activity in surrounding homogenized forests (*Schowalter and Means*, 1989; *Franklin, Perry, Schowalter, Harmon, McKee and Spies*, 1989).

A large body of scientific evidence also indicates that increased edge effect and increased sunlight into stands, resulting from reduced canopy cover associated with timber harvest, can directly promote the population abundance, productivity and persistence of insects which cause mortality to trees of (*Roland*, 1993; *Rothman and Roland*, 1998; *Kouki, McCullough and Marshall*, 1997; *Bellinger, Ravlin and McManus*, 1989)."

"**Applying Ecological Principles to Management of the U.S. National Forests**"
Issues in Ecology Number 6 Spring 2000
http://www.esa.org/science_resources/issues/FileEnglish/issue6.pdf

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #4 - "The biggest ecological con job in years is being waged by the U.S. Republican party and their timber industry cronies. They are blaming the recent Western wildfires on environmentalists, and assuring the public that commercial logging will reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfires."

Barry, Glen, Ph.D. "**Commercial Logging Caused Wildfires**"
Published by the *Portland Independent Media Center*, August 2002.
http://portland.indymedia.org/en/2002/08/17464.shtml

Timber Harvest Opposing View #5 - "According to a 1998 poll by a firm that has worked for several Republican House members and two presidents, 69 percent of Americans oppose commercial logging on federally owned land. The Forests Service's

own poll showed that 59 percent of Americans who expressed an opinion oppose timber sales and other commodity production in national forests."

"Many Americans are surprised to learn that logging is even allowed on public lands. Alas, it has been since the Organic Act of 1897 first authorized logging in America's new forest reserves. That legislation called for watershed protection and a steady supply of timber - what the Forest Service calls 'multiple use.' "

"But the agency has been unable to balance those goals. More often than not, the integrity of the forest ecosystem has been sacrificed to maximize timber and other commodities. And at taxpayer expense, notes Bernie Zaleha, chair of the End Commercial Logging on Federal Lands (ECL) campaign. The Forest Service lost $2 billion on its logging program from 1992 to 1997, according to the General Accounting Office. It spends more on building roads and preparing sales than it gets back in timber receipts."

Barry, John Byrne. "**Stop the Logging, Start the Restoration**"
from *The Planet* newsletter
June 1999, Volume 6, Number 5
http://www.sierraclub.org/planet/199905/ecl1.asp

Timber Harvest Opposing View #6 - "Federal auditors have found that the Forest Service frequently fails to assess, prevent or correct environmental damage from logging on the national forests.

After inspecting 12 timber projects in the field from 1995 to 1998, the Agriculture Department's inspector general found that all were deficient and that 'immediate corrective action is needed.'

A new report on the audits found that the environmental studies required before logging was approved were poorly done, the rules to protect streams and wildlife habitat from undue damage during logging were not followed, and the steps planned to repair some of the harm after logging were not carried out.

The inspector general, Roger C. Viadero, reported on Jan. 15 to Mike Dombeck, chief of the Forest Service, that the review had found ''numerous serious deficiencies.'' Agency officials generally agreed with the report's conclusions and recommendations."

Cushman, John H. Jr. "**Audit Faults Forest Service on Logging Damage in U.S. Forests**" *New York Times*, February 5, 1999
http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9B00E2DF163BF936A35751C0A96F958260&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=print

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #7 - "The timber harvest shouldn't be dominant. It should be on an equal plane with recreation concerns, with wildlife concerns, hunting, fishing, protecting our cultural heritage. That's what the American public is asking us to do."

Dombeck, Mike Ph.D. **"Through the Woods"**
The News Hour with Jim Lehrer. 19 June 1998.
http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/fedagencies/jan-june98/road_6-19.html

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #8 - "I recently read a letter from a line officer who chided local managers for being behind schedule relative to meeting the region's 'timber targets.' My expectation is that line officers will demand similar accountability for meeting watershed restoration, fish and wildlife habitat, riparian, recreation, cultural resource, and wilderness management goals."

"We need to do a better job talking about, and managing for, the values that are so important to so many people. Values such as wilderness and roadless areas, clean water, protection of rare species, old growth forests, naturalness -- these are the reasons most Americans cherish their public lands."

"Fifty years ago, Aldo Leopold wrote his seminal work, *A Sand County Almanac*. In it, Leopold spoke of his personal land ethic and the need for land managers to extend their own ecological conscience to resource decisions. The Forest Service natural resource agenda is an expression of our agency's land ethic. If we are to redeem our role as conservation leaders, it is not enough to be loyal to the Forest Service organization. First and foremost, we must be loyal to our land ethic. In fifty years, we will not be remembered for the resources we developed; we will be thanked for those we maintained and restored for future generations."

Dombeck, Mike Ph.D.
a message on "Conservation Leadership" sent to all USFS employees on July 1, 1998
http://www.wvhighlands.org/VoicePast/VoiceAug98/Dombeck.Aug98.html

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #9 - "For much of the past century the Forest Service, entrusted as the institutional steward of our National Forests, focused its management on an industrial-scale logging program. The result of the massive logging and road construction program was to damage watersheds, destroy wildlife habitat and imperil plant and animal species."

"The continued logging of our National Forests also wastes American tax dollars and diminishes the possibilities of future economic benefits. The Forest Service lost $2 billion dollars on the commercial logging program between 1992-1997. Annually, timber produces roughly $4 billion while recreation, fish and wildlife, clean water, and unroaded areas provide a combined total of $224 billion to the American economy. Forests purify our drinking water - 60 million Americans get their drinking water from National Forests. When the dramatic values of ecological goods and services are taken into account, it is clear that protecting National Forests creates more economic benefits than continued logging."

Ehrlich, Anne Ph.D., David Foster Ph.D. and Peter Raven Ph.D. 2002
"**Call to End Logging Based on Conservation Biology**." *Native Forest Network*.
http://www.nativeforest.org/campaigns/public_lands/stb_5_30_02.htm

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #10 - "The Bush administration has announced plans to greatly increase logging on federal lands in order to reduce the risk of wildfires. The Forest Service is using the fear of wildfires to allow logging companies to remove medium-and large-diameter trees that they can sell, rather than just the small trees and brush that can make fires more severe. There is little evidence to show that such logging will prevent catastrophic fires; on the contrary, logging roads and industrial logging cause wildfires. Bush is a well known supporter of the timber industry and has accepted huge sums of money from wealthy timber company leaders. He is promoting

misinformation about forest fires in order to benefit timber industry campaign contributors."

"**Bush Fire Policy: Clearing Forests So They Do Not Burn**"
FOREST CONSERVATION NEWS TODAY, August 27, 2002
http://forests.org/archived_site/today/recent/2002/tiporefl.htm

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #11 - "The proposition that forest values are protected with more, rather than less logging, and that forest reserves are not only unnecessary, but undesirable, has great appeal to many with a vested interest in maximizing timber harvest. These ideas are particularly attractive to institutions and individuals whose incomes depend upon a forest land base. (page 2)"

"On the other hand, approaches that involve reserving of a portion of the land base, or harvest practices that leave commercially valuable trees uncut to achieve ecological goals, are often considered much less desirable as they reduce traditional sources of timber income. (page 2)"

Franklin, Jerry Ph.D., David Perry Ph.D., Reed Noss Ph.D., David Montgomery Ph.D. and Christopher Frissell Ph.D. 2000. **"Simplified Forest Management to Achieve Watershed and Forest Health: A Critique."**
http://www.coastrange.org/documents/forestreport.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #12 - "Consequently, we specifically criticize the "simplified structure-based management" approaches derived from simple structural models and traditional silvicultural systems such as clearcutting. In our view, the assumptions underpinning simplified structure-based management (SSBM) are not supported by the published scientific literature on structural development of natural forests, disturbance ecology, landscape ecology and conservation biology, or by the relationships between ecosystem structures and processes. In this report, we review scientific findings associated with each of these areas with particular attention to the over-simplified structural models associated with SSBM and the importance and viability of forest reserves to achieve various ecological goals. (page 2)

“We do not believe, however, that scientific literature or forestry experience supports the notions that intensively managed forests can duplicate the role of natural forests, or that sufficient knowledge and ability exist to create even an approximation of a natural old-growth forest stand.” (page 3)

Franklin, Jerry F. Ph.D. and James K. Agee Ph.D.
2007. “**Forging a Science-Based National Forest Fire Policy.**”
Issues in Science and Technology.
A National Wildlife Federation publication sponsored by the Bullitt Foundation
http://www.coastrange.org/documents/forestreport.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #13 - “But the majority of the protesters were angry about Bush’s plans to implement rules that would thin our national forests to reduce fire risk. Cascadia Forest Alliance volunteer Carrie Taylor said Bush’s plan to log mature and old forests “will only increase fire risks while providing taxpayer subsidized logs to the timber industry.”

“According to the Cascadia Forest Alliance, under the Bush proposal, ‘environmental laws and citizen involvement will be undermined or suspended so that federal land management agencies can increase logging and roadbuilding on public lands, one of the timber industry's highest priorities.’”

Giuliano, Jackie Alan, Ph.D. “**Fire Suppression Bush Style: Cut Down the Trees!**” *Environmental News Service*, 2008.
http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/aug2002/2002-08-23g.asp

Timber Harvest Opposing View #14 - "Most of the trees that need to be removed to reduce accumulated fuels are small in diameter and have little or no commercial value."

"Mechanically removing fuels (through commercial timber harvesting and other means) can also have adverse effects on wildlife habitat and water quality in many areas. Officials told GAO that, because of these effects, a large-scale expansion of commercial timber harvesting alone for removing materials would not be feasible. However, because the Forest Service relies on the timber program for funding many of its activities, including reducing fuels, it has often used this program to address the wildfire

problem. The difficulty with such an approach, however, is that the lands with commercially valuable timber are often not those with the greatest wildfire hazards."

Government Accounting Office
"**Western National Forests: A Cohesive Strategy is Needed to Address Catastrophic Wildfire Threats**"
GAO/RCED-99-65
http://www.gao.gov/archive/1999/rc99065.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #15 - "The recent concern over the poor health of western pine ecosystems has been attributed at least partly to inappropriate silvicultural practices, both before and since the national forests were established. (4) Because of the timber industry's needs, logging in mixed conifer stands has emphasized cutting the large pines and leaving the true firs and Douglas-fir to dominate the remaining stands. (5) However, true firs and Douglas-fir are more susceptible to the damage (including insect and disease attacks as well as direct damage) that has occurred during the decade-long drought in the interior West, and thus may contribute to the risk of catastrophic wildfires. Salvage sales are one tool that can be used to improve forest health, (6) but critics object to granting the agency the discretion to use timber sales to correct problems partially created by past timber sales."

"A more general concern in some quarters is over Forest Service "bias" toward timber outputs, at the expense of ecosystem conditions and other resource values. While timber harvests are important, other important values are not measured, and managers are not rewarded for achieving these other values. (7) Some have attributed this "bias" to inappropriate incentives, particularly related to the agency's numerous trust funds and special accounts. (8) The Forest Service has several trust funds and special accounts that are either funded by timber revenues or provide funds for timber management (or both). (9)"

"One trust fund often cited by critics is the Knutson-Vandenberg (K-V) Fund. This account receives an unlimited portion of timber sale receipts, to be used for reforestation, timber stand improvements, and other resource mitigation and enhancement activities in timber sale areas. Forest Service managers can, therefore, fund their programs from timber sales; in the words of one critic, wildlife managers have an incentive to support timber sales that damage wildlife habitat, because they can use the revenues to mitigate that damage and to keep themselves and their staffs employed. (10)"

Gorte, Ross W. Ph.D. "**Forest Service Timber Sale Practices and**

Procedures: Analysis of Alternative Systems." A Congressional Research Service (CRS) report, October 30, 1995.
http://www.ncseonline.org/NLE/CRS/abstract.cfm?NLEid=215

Timber Harvest Opposing View #16 - "In April 1999, the General Accounting Office issued a report that raised serious questions about the use of timber sales as a tool of fire management. It noted that "most of the trees that need to be removed to reduce accumulated fuels are small in diameter" -- the very trees that have 'little or no commercial value.' "

"As it offers timber for sale to loggers, the Forest Service tends to 'focus on areas with high-value commercial timber rather than on areas with high fire hazards,' the report said. Its sales include 'more large, commercially valuable trees' than are necessary to reduce the so-called accumulated fuels (in other words, the trees that are most likely to burn in a forest fire)."

"The truth is that timber sales are causing catastrophic wildfires on national forests, not alleviating them. The Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project Report, issued in 1996 by the federal government, found that 'timber harvest, through its effects on forest structure, local microclimate and fuel accumulation, has increased fire severity more than any other recent human activity.' The reason goes back to the same conflict that the G.A.O. found: loggers want the big trees, not the little ones that act as fuel in forest fires."

"After a 'thinning' timber sale, a forest has far fewer of the large trees, which are naturally fire-resistant because of their thick bark; indeed, many of these trees are centuries old and have already survived many fires. Without them, there is less shade. The forest is drier and hotter, making the remaining, smaller trees more susceptible to burning. After logging, forests also have accumulations of flammable debris known as "slash piles" -- unsalable branches and limbs left by logging crews."

Hanson, Chad Ph.D., "**Commercial Logging Doesn't Prevent Catastrophic Fires, It Causes Them**." Published in the *New York Times*, May 19, 2000
http://www.commondreams.org/views/051900-101.htm

Timber Harvest Opposing View #17 - "The Forest Service keeps the vast majority of timber sale revenues, which gives it a perverse incentive to do more cutting. It has developed a huge bureaucracy around the selling of timber from national forest land."

Hanson, Chad, Ph.D. "**Logging for Dollars in National Forests**"
Special to *The Sacramento Bee* - November 14, 2001
http://www.johnmuirproject.org/news-logging-for-dollars.html

Timber Harvest Opposing View #18 - "Recent editorials by timber industry spokespersons are a wildly misleading attempt to promote increased logging of western U.S. forests under the guise of reducing wildland fires …"

Hanson, Chad Ph.D., "**Logging Industry Misleads on Climate and Forest Fires**." Guest Commentary in *New West*, July 11, 2008
http://www.newwest.net/topic/article/logging_industry_misleads_on_climate_and_forest_fires/C41/L41/

Timber Harvest Opposing View #19 - "Logging reduces the organic parent material (duff and woody residues) available for soil-formation processes."

Harvey, A. E., M. J. Larsen, and M. F. Jurgensen
"**Distribution of Ectomycorrhizae in a Mature Douglas-fir/larch Forest Soil in Western Montana**"
Forest Science, Volume 22, Number 4, 1 December 1976 , pp. 393-398(6)
http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/saf/fs/1976/00000022/00000004/art00007;jsessionid=l2sdf2hphia2.alexandra

Timber Harvest Opposing View #20 - "For too long, we foresters took the public for granted, assuming unwavering support for those who grow the nation's wood fiber. Few

noticed when the public's mood changed, and those who did were often ridiculed by disbelieving colleagues. Now we come to a day of reckoning: the public believes forests are too important to be entrusted to foresters. To restore lost confidence, foresters must first come out of hiding. We have a lot of explaining to do because, where forests are concerned, the public will no longer support what it cannot see and understand. Regaining the public's trust will take time. We must be prepared to answer hard questions about what we are doing and how our actions are impacting the environment. We must also help the public think through its forest management options. When we lay out these options, we must speak of much more than trees. Only then will our critics know we love forests as much as they do."

Houston, Alan Ph.D., **"Why Forestry is in Trouble with the Public."**
Evergreen magazine, October 1997.
http://evergreenmagazine.com/web/Why_forestry_is_in_trouble_with_the_public-v2.html

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #21 - "SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

> Commercial logging has many indirect costs which are very significant, but not easily measured, such as flooding damage and relief of flooding damage through Federal funds, damage to the salmon fishing industry; and harm to the recreation and tourism industries."

H. R. 1494 text. April 4, 2001
http://www.agriculturelaw.com/legis/bills107/hr1494.htm

Timber Harvest Opposing View #22 - "Human tampering with nature has not been without costs. Human manipulation of existing ecosystems has also sometimes had unfortunate consequences."

Hudak, Mike Ph.D. "**From Prairie Dogs to Oysters: How Biodiversity Sustains Us**"
from his book review of
The Work of Nature: How the Diversity of Life Sustains Us
by Yvonne Baskin, 1997

Newsletter of Earth Day Southern Tier, February/March 1999, p. 2
http://www.mikehudak.com/Articles/FromPrairieDogs9902.html

Timber Harvest Opposing View #23 - "In general, rate of spread and flame length were positively correlated with the proportion of area logged (hereafter, area logged) for the sample watersheds. Correlation coefficients of area logged with rate of spread were > 0.57 for five of the six river basins (table 5). Rate of spread for the Pend Oreille and Wenatchee River basins was strongly associated (r-0.89) with area logged. Correlation of area logged with flame length were > 0.42 for four of six river basins (table 5). The Deschutes and Methow River basins showed the strongest relations. All harvest techniques were associated with increasing rate of spread and flame length, but strength of the associations differed greatly among river basins and harvesting methods." (pg.9)

"As a by-product of clearcutting, thinning, and other tree-removal activities, activity fuels create both short- and long-term fire hazards to ecosystems. The potential rate of spread and intensity of fires associated with recently cut logging residues is high, especially the first year or two as the material decays. High fire-behavior hazards associated with the residues can extend, however, for many years depending on the tree. Even though these hazards diminish, their influence on fire behavior can linger for up to 30 years in the dry forest ecosystems of eastern Washington and Oregon."

Huff, Mark H. Ph.D.; Ottmar, Roger D.; Alvarado, Ernesto Ph.D.
Vihnanek, Robert E.; Lehmkuhl, John F.; Hessburg, Paul F. Ph.D.
Everett, Richard L. Ph.D. 1995. "**Historical and current forest landscapes in eastern Oregon and Washington. Part II: Linking vegetation characteristics to potential fire behavior and related smoke production**" Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-355. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.
https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/4706/PB96155213.pdf;jsessionid=C8DDB611DB29D3716BBF313AADBA2E70?sequence=1

Timber Harvest Opposing View #24 - "The Quincy Library Group's (QLG's) fuelbreak strategy represents a giant step backwards from the progressive development of

rational fire policies established by the 1995 Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy and Program Review."

"The fact that the QLG admits that its Plan is inconsistent with these new policies (indeed, is almost gleefully defiant of them) says a lot about the credibility of the QLG's self-purported fire management expertise."

"In spite of (or more likely because of) the intensive 'fuels reduction' activities associated with commercial logging, the Fountain Fire was truly catastrophic in its effects."

"Even 'kinder, gentler' commercial logging still inflicts environmental impacts such as eroded topsoil, degraded water quality, destroyed wildlife habitat, and extirpated species that are every bit as much symptoms of forest health problems as large-scale, severe wildfires."

"And after spending millions of dollars creating the SNEP Report, it seems wise to use its information, not ignore it or opportunistically select out statements clearly worded as assumptions, values, or goals which run contrary to factual research findings. The QLG Plan has much more to do with timber extraction than with genuine fire protection, and in that respect, it constitutes more of a forest health threat than a real solution."

"The QLG Bill resembles similar 'panic legislation' that was passed during the early 1970s in which, following some large-scale wildfires in California, Congress allowed the Forest Service to access emergency firefighting funds to conduct 'presuppression' timber sales. Many fuelbreaks were cut in the Sierras during this period, and while costs rapidly rose into tens of millions of dollars, most of these fuelbreaks failed to perform adequately during wildfire suppression incidents. Congress quickly had to take away this funding source from the Forest Service. What has become of these old fuelbreaks? Almost without exception, the agency failed to monitor or maintain them, and in a modern-day version of 'cut and run' logging, many of these old fuelbreaks have converted to chaparral brush and 'dog-hair' thickets … a much more flammable vegetation type than the original forest cover. The QLG Bill appears to be 'deja vu' without evidence of Congress or the QLG being aware of this history of previous fuelbreak programs."

Ingalsbee, Timothy Ph.D. **"Logging for Firefighting: A Critical Analysis of the Quincy Library Group Fire Protection Plan."**
Unpublished research paper. 1997.
http://www.fire-ecology.org/research/logging-for-firefighting_2.htm

Timber Harvest Opposing View #25 - “The notion that commercial logging can prevent wildfires has its believers and loud proponents, but this belief does not match up with the scientific evidence or history of federal management practices. In fact, it is widely recognized that past commercial logging, road-building, livestock grazing and aggressive firefighting are the sources for "forest health" problems such as increased insect infestations, disease outbreaks, and severe wildfires.”

“How can the sources of these problems also be their solution? This internal contradiction needs more than propaganda to be resolved. It is time for the timber industry and their supporters to heed the facts, not fantasies, and develop forest management policies based on science, not politics.”

Ingalsbee, Timothy Ph.D. 2000. “**Commercial Logging for Wildfire Prevention: Facts Vs Fantasies**”
http://www.fire-ecology.org/citizen/logging_and_wildfires.htm

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #26 - "Since the 'New Perspectives' program of the early 1990s, the agency has tried to dodge public opposition to commercial logging by using various euphemisms, such as this gem from the Siskiyou National Forest: Clearcuts are called 'minimum green tree retention units.' Accordingly, Forest Service managers have believed that if they simply refer to logging as 'thinning,' or add the phrases 'fuels reduction' or 'forest restoration' to the title of their timber sale plans, then the public will accept these projects at face value, and business-as-usual commercial logging can proceed. In the face of multiple scandals and widespread public skepticism of the Forest Service's credibility, it seems that only Congress is buying the agency's labeling scheme."

Ingalsbee, Timothy Ph.D. “**Logging without Limits isn't a Solution to Wildfires**” published in the *Portland Oregonian,* August 6, 2002
http://www.klamathforestalliance.org/Documents/loggingwithoutlimits.html

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #27 - “Thus, the use of commercial logging for fire hazard reduction poses yet another paradox: Logging removes the trees that normally

survive fires, leaves behind the trees that are most often killed by fire, increases flammable fuel loads, and worsens fire weather conditions." (pg. 5)

Ingalsbee, Timothy Ph.D. "**The wildland fires of 2002 illuminate fundamental questions about our relationship to fire**."
The Oregon Quarterly, Winter 2002
http://www.fire-ecology.org/research/wildfire_paradox.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #28 - "In the face of growing public scrutiny and criticism of the agency's logging policies and practices, the Forest Service and their enablers in Congress have learned to mask timber sales as so-called 'fuels reduction' and 'forest restoration' projects. Yet, the net effect of these logging projects is to actually increase fire risks and fuel hazards."

"Decades of encouraging private logging companies to take the biggest, oldest, most fire-resistant trees from public lands, while leaving behind a volatile fuel load of small trees, brush, weeds, stumps and slash has vastly increased the flammability of forestlands."

"In addition to post-fire salvage logging, the Forest Service and timber industry advocates in Congress have been pushing pre-fire timber sales, often falsely billed as hazardous fuels reduction or 'thinning' projects, to lower the risk or hazard of future wildfires. In too many cases, these so-called thinning projects are logging thick-diameter fire-resistant overstory trees instead of or in addition to cutting thin-sized fire-susceptible understory trees. The resulting logging slash and the increased solar and wind exposure can paradoxically increase the fuel hazards and fire risks."

Ingalsbee, Timothy Ph.D. **"Fanning the Flames! The U.S. Forest Service: A Fire-Dependent Bureaucracy."**
Missoula Independent. Vol. 14 No. 24, June 2003
http://www.fire-ecology.org/research/USFS_fire_dependent.html

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #29 - "More than any other recent human activity, the legacy of commercial timber extraction has made public forests more flammable and

less resilient to fire. Firstly, clearcut and high-grade logging have historically taken the largest, most fire-resilient, most commercially-valuable trees, and left behind dead needles and limbs (logging debris called "slash"), along with smaller trees and brush that are less commercially valuable but more flammable than mature and old-growth trees. The net effect is to increase the amount of available hazardous fuel."

"Secondly, the removal of large overstory trees also changes the microclimate of logged sites, making them hotter, drier, and windier, which increases the intensity and rate of spread of wildfires. Third, the creation of densely-stocked even-aged plantations of young conifers made sites even more flammable since this produced a solid mass of highly combustible conifer needles within easy reach of surface flames. These changes in the fuel load, fuel profile, and microclimate make logged sites more prone to high-intensity and high-severity wildfires."

Ingalsbee, Timothy Ph.D. 2005. "**A Reporter's Guide to Wildland Fire**." Published by the Firefighters United for Safety, Ethics, and Ecology (FUSE), January 2005
http://www.commondreams.org/news2005/0111-14.htm

Timber Harvest Opposing View #30 - "Linear developments may result in habitat avoidance for grizzly bears. Logging-truck traffic in the Kimsquit Valley in British Columbia resulted in a 78% reduction in use of the "Zone of Hauling Activity" by radio collared bears compared to non-hauling periods (16). For 14 hours/day, 3%-23% of each bear's home range was unavailable to them because of disturbance."

"The impacts of land-use activities on wolverines are *likely* similar to those on grizzly bears. Wolverines seem to have been most affected by activities that fragment and supplant habitat, such as human settlement, extensive logging, oil and gas development, mining, recreational developments, and the accompanying access. Wolverine populations that are now at the edge of extirpation have been relegated to the last available habitat that has not been developed, extensively modified, or accessed by humans."

Jalkotzy, M.G., P.I. Ross, and M.D. Nasserden. 1997. "**The Effects of Linear Developments on Wildlife: A Review of Selected Scientific Literature**." Prepared for Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. Arc Wildlife Services Ltd., Calgary. 115pp.
http://www.capp.ca/getdoc.aspx?DocId=24902&DT=PDF

Timber Harvest Opposing View #31 - "History, not science, refutes the claim that logging helps to prevent forest fires.

The forests of the West are far more vulnerable to fire due to a century of industrial logging and fire suppression. Logging has removed most of the older, fire-resistant trees from the forests.

Fire suppression has encouraged many smaller and more flammable trees, brush and dense plantations to fill the holes. Logging has set the forests of the West up to burn big and hot.

More logging will not fix this."

Keene, Roy "**Logging does not prevent wildfires**"
Guest Viewpoint, the Eugene *Register Guard*
January 11, 2009
http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-192070397.html

Timber Harvest Opposing View #32 - "Fear of wildfire is heavily used to sell these forest "restoration" schemes. Logging has not been proven, in practice, to reduce fire frequency or intensity. Historically, the largest, most destructive blazes, like the Tillamook conflagration, were caused from logging or fueled by slash. Unlogged forests, cool and shaded, are typically more fire resistant than cut over, dried-up stands choked with slash and weeds.

Large-scale logging (by any name) has devalued our forests, degraded our waters, damaged soils, and endangered a wide variety of plants and animals. How will the current round of politically and environmentally propelled 'restorative' logging proposals differ, in practice, from past logging regimes?"

Keene, Roy **Restorative Logging? "More rarity than reality"**
Guest Viewpoint, the Eugene *Register Guard*
March 10, 2011

http://eugeneweekly.com/2011/03/03/views3.html

Timber Harvest Opposing View #33 - "Timber harvesting operations affect hydrologic processes by reducing canopy interception and evapotranspiration. Many studies have documented changes in soil properties following tractor yarding (Stone, 1977; Cafferata, l983), and low-ground-pressure skidding (Sidle and Drlica, 1981). More recently, researchers have evaluated cable yarding (Miller and Sirois, 1986; Purser and Cundy, 1992). In general, these studies report decreased hydraulic conductivity and increased bulk density in forest soils after harvest."

Keppeler, Elizabeth T. Robert R. Ziemer Ph.D., and Peter H. Cafferata
"Effects of Human-Induced Changes on Hydrologic Systems."
An American Water Resources Association publication, June 1994
http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/ziemer/Ziemer94a.PDF

Timber Harvest Opposing View #34 - "Among these four species of amphibians, the spotted salamander is most likely to be affected adversely by the logging as this species of salamander relies on dense forests with full canopies (Harding, 1997)."

"Looking at the study on a larger scale, the potential for changes caused by logging is great. Absence of trees could influence water temperature by altering available sunlight, conductivity by changing the amount of organic matter that collects in the vernal ponds, or pH if the logging process deposits foreign residues to the area. Also heavy equipment used to harvest the timber has the potential to alter the terrain."

"Modifications to the landscape could change how water flows and collects at the surface and change the size, shape, and location of the vernal ponds. Loss or alteration to small temporary water sources less than four hectares can be extremely detrimental to amphibians water (Semlitsch, 2000). Without vernal ponds amphibians would have difficulty inhabiting forested areas because they rely on the ponds as breeding grounds. If logging disturbs the ponds, amphibian populations could diminish in the areas that surround these vernal pools."

Klein, Al 2004. ***Logging Effects on Amphibian Larvae***

***Populations in Ottawa National Forest*.**
http://www.nd.edu/~underc/east/education/documents/AKlein2004Pre-loggingsurveyofamphibianlarvaeinvernalpools.pdf

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #35 - "The Congressional Research Service (CRS) recently addressed the effect of logging on wildfires in an August 2000 report and found that the current wave of forest fires is not related to a decline in timber harvest on Federal lands. From a quantitative perspective, the CRS study indicates a very weak relationship between acres logged and the extent and severity of forest fires. To the contrary, in the most recent period (1980 through 1999) the data indicate that fewer acres burned in areas where logging activity was limited."

"Qualitative analysis by CRS supports the same conclusion. The CRS stated: "[T]imber harvesting removes the relatively large diameter wood that can be converted into wood products, but leaves behind the small material, especially twigs and needles. The concentration of these fine fuels on the forest floor increases the rate of spread of wildfires." Similarly, the National Research Council found that logging and clearcutting can cause rapid regeneration of shrubs and trees that can create highly flammable fuel conditions within a few years of cutting."

Laverty, Lyle, USDA Forest Service and Tim Hartzell U.S. Department of the Interior
"**A Report to the President in Response to the Wildfires of 2000**", September 8, 2000.
http://frames.nacse.org/6000/6269.html

Timber Harvest Opposing View #36 - "I will turn first to forest thinning aimed at reducing fire risks. There is surprisingly little scientific information about how thinning actually affects overall fire risk in national forests."

"How can it be that thinning could increase fire risks? First, thinning lets in sunlight and wind, both of which dry out the forest interior and increase flammability. Second, the most flammable material - brush, limbs, twigs, needles, and saplings - is difficult to remove and often left behind. Third, opening up forests promotes brushy, flammable undergrowth. Fourth, logging equipment compacts soil so that water runs off instead of filtering in to keep soils moist and trees healthy. Fifth, thinning introduces diseases and

pests, wounds the trees left behind, and generally disrupts natural processes, including some that regulate forest health, all the more so if road construction is involved."

Lawrence, Nathaniel, NRDC senior attorney
"**Gridlock on the National Forests**" Testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health (Committee on Resources) December 4, 2001.
http://www.nrdc.org/land/forests/tnl1201.asp

Timber Harvest Opposing View #37 - "Those who would argue that this form of logging has any positive effects on an ecosystem are clearly misinformed. This type of logging has side effects related to wildfires, first and foremost being that the lumber companies aren't interested in hauling out all the smaller trees, branches, leaves, pine needles, sawdust, and other debris generated by cutting all these trees. All this debris is left on site, quickly dries out, and is far more flammable sitting dead on the ground than it was living in the trees. Smaller, non-commercially viable trees are left behind (dead) as well - creating even more highly flammable fuel on the ground.

Leitner, Brian. "**Logging Companies are Responsible for the California Wildfires**." the *Democratic Underground*, October 30, 2003.
http://www.democraticunderground.com/articles/03/10/30_logging.html

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #38 - "We concluded that commercial timber sales do not meet the criteria for forest restoration." (Pg. 11)

Long, Richard D., U.S. Department of Agriculture Office of Inspector General
"Western Region Audit Report: Forest Service National Fire Plan Implementation"
Report No. 08601-26-SF, November 2001.
http://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/08601-26-SF.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #39 - “In hopes of ending conflicts over "multiple use," an independent scientific committee has proposed that "ecological sustainability" should become the principal goal in managing the U.S. national forests and grasslands, which since 1960 have been under a congressional mandate to serve industry, recreation, and conservation all at once.”

Mann, Charles C. Ph.D. and Mark L. Plummer Ph.D.
“Call for 'Sustainability' in Forests Sparks a Fire”
Science 26 March 1999: Vol. 283. no. 5410, pp. 1996 – 1998
http://www.sciencemag.org/content/283/5410/1996.summary

Timber Harvest Opposing View #40 - "Logging removes a mass that harbor a myriad of organisms, from bacteria and actinomycetes to higher fungi. The smaller organisms, not visible to the unaided eye, are still important components of the system."

Maser, C. Ph.D., and J. M. Trappe Ph.D.
“**The Seen and Unseen World of the Fallen Tree**”*,* 1984
USDA Forest Service, *GTR-PNW-164*
http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/publications/pnw_gtr164/

Timber Harvest Opposing View #41 - "Logging removes mature and maturing trees which conserve essential elements, whereas the area containing new very young planted trees following logging are susceptible to erosion and essential element loss." (pg.5)

"Logging removes tree parts that would have created and maintained diversity in forest communities." (pg. 44)

Maser, C. Ph.D., R. F. Tarrant, J. M. Trappe Ph.D., and J. F. Franklin Ph.D. 1988
"***The Forest to the Sea: A Story of Fallen Trees***"
USDA Forest Service, *GTR-PNW-GTR-229*
http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/publications/pnw_gtr229/

Timber Harvest Opposing View #42 - "In addition to the direct effects of habitat loss and fragmentation, logging typically reduces ecosystem health by:

a) damaging aquatic habitats through siltation, reduction in stream complexity and increased water temperatures."

McIntosh, B.A., J.R. Sedell, J.E. Smith, R.C. Wissmar
S.E. Clarke, G.H. Reeves, and L.A. Brown
"**Management history of eastside ecosystems: changes in fish habitat over 50 years, 1935-1992**." 1994
GTR-321 93-181
http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/publications/pnw_gtr321/

Timber Harvest Opposing View #43 - "Logging practices can indirectly result in changes in the biological components of a stream, and can have direct and indirect on the physical environment in streams.

The primary environmental changes of concern are the effects of siltation, logging debris, gravel scouring, destruction of developing embryos and alevins, blockage of streamflow, decrease in surface and intragravel dissolved oxygen, increase in maximum and diel water temperatures, changes in pool/riffle ratios and cover, redistribution of fishes, reduction in fish numbers, and reduction in total biomass."

Moring, John R. Ph.D. 1975. "**The Alsea Watershed Study: Effects of Logging on the Aquatic Resources of Three Headwater Streams of the Alsea River, Oregon – Part III**." *Fishery Report Number 9*
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.
http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfd/library/ffip/Moring_JR1975b.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #44 - "Biodiversity in managed ecosystems is poor. Less biodiverse communities and ecosystems are more susceptible to adverse weather (such as drought) and exotic invaders, and have greatly reduced rates of biomass production and nutrient cycling."

"All of these studies show that ecosystem functioning is decreased as the number of species in a community decreases. Declines in functioning can be particularly acute when the number of species is low, such as in most managed ecosystems including croplands or timber plantations."

"Recent evidence demonstrates that both the magnitude and stability of ecosystem functioning are likely to be significantly altered by declines in local diversity, especially when diversity reaches the low levels typical of managed ecosystems."

Naeem, Shahid Ph.D., F.S. Chapin III Ph.D., Robert Costanza Ph.D.,
Paul R. Ehrlich Ph.D., Frank B. Golley Ph.D., David U. Hooper Ph.D.
J.H. Lawton Ph.D., Robert V. O'Neill Ph.D., Harold A. Mooney Ph.D.
Osvaldo E. Sala Ph.D., Amy J. Symstad Ph.D., and David Tilman Ph.D.
"Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning: Maintaining Natural Life Support Processes." *Issues in Ecology* No. 4. Fall 1999.
http://www.esa.org/science_resources/issues/TextIssues/issue4.php

Timber Harvest Opposing View #45 - "As a result of the Forest Service's well-documented mismanagement over many years of the timber sale program, taxpayers also have been stuck with the tab for hundreds of millions of dollars worth of subsidies to a profitable timber industry."

Nappier, Sharon. ***Lost in the Forest: How the Forest Service's Misdirection, Mismanagement, and Mischief Squanders Your Tax Dollars***.
Taxpayers for Common Sense, 2002.
http://www.ourforests.org/fact/lostintheforest.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #46 - "Agroforestry does reduce biodiversity. In forests used for logging, whole-landscape management is crucial. Here, emphasis is placed on areas of intensive use interspersed with areas for conservation and catchment purposes. Management strategies for sustainable forestry are being developed, but there is a need for further interaction among foresters, ecologists, community representatives, social scientists, and economists."

Noble, Ian R. and Rodolfo Dirzo Ph.D. **"Forests as Human-Dominated Ecosystems."** *Science* Vol. 277. No. 5325, pp. 522 - 525. 25 July 1997. http://www.sciencemag.org/content/277/5325/522.abstract?maxtoshow=&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&fulltext=logging&searchid=1136659907310_5043&FIRSTINDEX=0&journalcode=sci

Timber Harvest Opposing View #47 - "The U.S. Forest Service has been sitting on a public opinion survey it commissioned, not knowing what to do with the results. The problem is that most people surveyed want more wilderness and less logging on the Green Mountain National Forest (GMNF), while the federal agency seems to want to build more roads and cut more trees."

"The survey conducted by Dr. Robert Manning of the School of Natural Resources at the University of Vermont, polled 1,500 Vermont households in the spring of 1995. A survey with similar results was completed last fall for the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire. 'It is clear that New England residents value the national forest for many reasons, but non-material values, such as aesthetics and ecological protection, are more important than material values, such as economic development,' said Dr. Manning."

"The responses to several survey questions indicate a strong public desire for more areas of wild, untouched nature on the GMNF and less roadbuilding and logging. Very few people supported clearcutting and other types of industrial logging, especially if natural beauty or wildlife habitat were harmed."

"For example:

- 82 percent wanted to ban clearcutting,
- 82 percent said logging should not hurt scenic beauty,
- 80 percent of the respondents wanted to protect remaining undisturbed forest; and
- 72 percent urged prohibition of logging if bear or other wildlife habitat would be harmed."

"Only 36 percent felt that management of the GMNF should emphasize timber and lumber products; and only 15 percent felt that jobs are more important than protection of endangered species."

"'The results of this survey and a similar one on the White Mountain National Forest in Vermont should serve as loud wake-up calls to the U.S. Forest Service,' said Northup. 'Forest Service officials have two choices: either begin a major overhaul of the agency's management programs or ignore the wishes of the people they are supposed to serve'."

Northup, Jim. 1999. **"Public Wants More Wilderness, Less Logging on Green Mountain NF"**. Press Release by Forest Watch, a Vermont-based environmental organization. http://www.forestwatch.org/content.php?id=10

Timber Harvest Opposing View #48 - "Still, forestry experts warned in the 2000 plan that logging should be used carefully and rarely; in fact, the original draft states plainly that the "removal of large merchantable trees from forests does not reduce fire risk and may, in fact, increase such risk."

"Now, critics charge that the Bush administration is ignoring that warning. Neil Lawrence, a policy analyst with the Natural Resource Defense Council, claims that Washington has taken a far more aggressive approach to incorporating commercial logging in its wildfire prevention plans. As a result, Lawrence and other critics say, the National Fire Plan is becoming a feeding ground for logging companies. Moreover, critics claim the administration's strategy, far from protecting the lives and homes of those most at risk, could actually increase the likelihood of wildfires."

Okoand Ilan Kayatsky, Dan. "**Fight Fire with Logging?**" *Mother Jones*, August 1, 2002 http://motherjones.com/politics/2002/08/fight-fire-logging

Timber Harvest Opposing View #49 - "In response to catastrophic wildfires, wide-reaching forest management policies have been enacted in recent years, most notably the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003. A key premise underlying these policies is that fire suppression has resulted in denser forests than were present historically in some western forest types. Therefore, although reducing the threat of wildfire is the primary goal, forest managers commonly view fuel treatments as a means to restore historic forest structure in those forest types that are outside of their historic range of variation. This study evaluates where both wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure are potentially needed in the ponderosa pine–dominated montane forest zone of Boulder County, Colorado. Two spatial models were overlain: a model of potential fireline intensity and a model of historic fire frequency. The overlay was then aggregated by land management classes.

Contrary to current assumptions, results of this study indicate that both wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure are needed in only a small part of the study area, primarily at low elevations.

Furthermore, little of this land is located on Forest Service land where most of the current thinning projects are taking place. We question the validity of thinning as a means both to reduce the threat of wildfire and to restore historic forest structure in the absence of site-specific data collection on past and present landscape conditions."

Platt, Rutherford V. Ph.D., Thomas T. Veblen Ph.D., and Rosemary L. Sherriff **"Are Wildfire Mitigation and Restoration of Historic Forest Structure Compatible? A Spatial Modeling Assessment"** Published Online: by the by Association of American Geographers. Sep. 8, 2006
http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/routledg/anna/2006/00000096/00000003/art00001

Timber Harvest Opposing View #50 - "Private lands are more suitable for timber production. National Forest land is on average of lower productivity and on steeper, higher elevation terrain than are private forestlands."

Powell, Douglas S. Ph.D, Joanne L. Faulkner, David R. Darr, Zhiliang Zhu Ph.D.

and Douglas W. MacCleery. 1992. **"Forest Resources of the United States."**
USDA Forest Service. Rocky Mt. Forest and Range Experiment Station.
Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-234.
http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs_rm/rm_gtr234.html

Timber Harvest Opposing View #52 - "Less than 5% of America's original forests remain, and these forests are found primarily on federal lands. Logging in the last core areas of biodiversity is destroying the remaining intact forest ecosystems in the United States. At the current rate of logging, these forests and their priceless biological assets will be destroyed within a few decades.

We urge Congress to pass the Act to Save America's Forests. It is the first nationwide legislation that would halt and reverse deforestation on all our federal lands. By implementing protective measures based on principles of conservation biology, the bill provides a scientifically sound legislative solution for halting the rapid decline of our nation's forest ecosystems.

The Act to Save America's Forests will:

- Make the preservation and restoration of native biodiversity the central mission of Federal forest management agencies.
- Ban extractive logging in core areas of biodiversity and the last remnant original forest ecosystems: roadless areas, ancient forests and special areas of outstanding biological value.
- Protect sensitive riparian areas and watershed values by banning extractive logging in streamside buffer zones.
- End clearcutting and other even age logging practices on federal land.
- Establish a panel of scientists to provide guidance to federal forest management.

We believe it is our professional responsibility to ask Congress to align Federal forest management with modern scientific understandings of forest ecosystems. Passage of the Act to Save America's Forests will give our nation's precious forest ecosystems the best chance or survival and recovery into the 21st century and beyond."

Raven, Peter, Ph.D., Jane Goodall, C.B.E., Ph.D., Edward O. Wilson, Ph. D.
and over 600 other leading biologists, ecologists, foresters, and scientists from

other forest specialties. From a 1998 letter to congress.
http://www.saveamericasforests.org/resources/Scientists.htm

Timber Harvest Opposing View #53 - "The Act to Save America's Forests is based on the principles of conservation biology. It would make the protection native biodiversity the primary goal of federal forest management agencies. The bill would protect over 20 million acres of core forest areas throughout the nation, including ancient forests, roadless areas, key watershed, and other special areas. It is a comprehensive, sustainable, and ecologically-sound plan for protecting and restoring the entire federal forest system.

If the current pace of logging planned by the Forest Service continues, nearly all of America's ancient and roadless wild forests will soon be lost forever. According to a recent report by the World Resources Institute, only one percent of the original forest cover remains in large blocks within the lower 48 states. The Act to Save America's Forests incorporates the solution recommended by the report, namely to protect core forest areas from any logging and to allow sustainable forest practices around these protected forests. Endorsed by over 600 leading scientists, this bill may be the last hope for America's forests."

Raven, Peter, Ph.D.,
from his February 9, 2001 letter to Senator Jean Carnahan
http://www.saveamericasforests.org/Raven.htm

Timber Harvest Opposing View #54 - "It is well established that logging and roadbuilding often increase both fuel loading and fire risk. For example, the Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project (SNEP) Science Team (1996) concluded that "timber harvest…. has increased fire severity more than any other recent human activity" in the Sierra Nevada. Timber harvest may increase fire hazard by drying of microclimate associated with canopy opening and with roads, by increases in fuel loading by generation of activity fuels, by increases in ignition sources associated with machinery and roads, by changes in species composition due to opening of stands, by the spread of highly flammable non native weeds, insects and disease, and by decreases in forest health associated with damage to soil and residual trees (DellaSala and Frost, 2001;

Graham et al., 2001; Weatherspoon et al., 1992; SNEP Science Team, 1996). Indeed a recent literature review reported that some studies have found a positive correlation between the occurrence of past logging and present fire hazard in some forest types in the Interior Columbia Basin (DellaSala and Frost, 2001)."

Roberson, Emily B. Ph.D., Senior Policy Analyst, California Native Plant Society
Excerpt from a letter to Chief Dale Bosworth and 5 members of congress
http://www.plantsocieties.org/PDFs/Fire%20letter%20CNPS%208.02%20letterhead.pdf

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #55 - "I will discuss my views on how activities related to timber harvest adversely affect coastal salmonids in California by destroying, altering, or otherwise disturbing the freshwater habitats upon which these fish depend during crucial phases of their life cycle. I base these opinions on my research and observations in the field, as well as my review of and familiarity with the scientific literature and publications of government agencies, commissions, and scientific review panels. Below I discuss in some detail the life history and habitat needs of coho salmon to illustrate how timber harvest and related roads affect this threatened species. Although Chinook salmon and steelhead trout have similar life histories and habitat needs, and also are negatively affected by timber harvest, I will use coho salmon in my discussion."

"Loss or degradation of stream habitat has been and remains the single most significant cause of the decline of anadromous salmonids in general in the Pacific Northwest. In my experience the most pervasive and severe impacts to coastal watersheds in California inhabited by coho salmon result from logging and associated activities. These activities cause significant alteration and degradation to coho salmon habitat by 1) increasing sediment input to salmon bearing streams and their tributaries: 2) by decreasing input of LWD into waterways; 3) by altering streamflow regimes, increasing the likelihood of scouring flows and flooding; and 4) by increasing water temperatures. These pervasive changes due to timber harvest decrease the complexity and suitability of coho salmon habitat, including adversely affecting insects and other organisms that provide food for fish."

Roelofs, Terry D. Ph.D. Testimony for the California State Water Board
and Regional Water Quality Control Boards Regarding Waivers of Waste
Discharge Requirements on Timber Harvest Plans. August 2003.
http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:QNy_aih1RxEJ:edennapa.org/thp/roelofstestimony.doc+%22timber+harvest%22+ph.d.+adverse&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=5&gl=us

Timber Harvest Opposing View #56 - "People moving to the region may do so for reasons related to the social environment and the physical landscape but not care about specific Federal land management practices. We found this not to be true, since 92 percent were concerned with how Federal lands were managed. The most frequent preferences for managing Federal lands were water/watershed and ecosystem protection (table 3). Timber harvesting was cited by 16 percent, grazing and ranching by 6 percent, and mineral exploration/mining by less than 1 percent. Overall, protective strategies made up 76 percent of the preferred management strategies and commodity-based strategies 23 percent. This same trend is evident for the second and third most stated preferences. These findings also contradict the longstanding view of the Federal lands as a public warehouse of commodities to be harvested and jobs to be filled. For newcomers in the rural West, the value of these public lands is related to protecting and preserving them."

Rudzitis, Gundars. 1999 "**Amenities Increasingly Draw People to the Rural West"**
Rural Development Perspectives, vol. 14, no. 2
http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/rdp/rdpsept99/rdpsept99b.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #57 - "Once clear-cutting has occurred, regulation and human silvicultural practices become responsible for the revegetation that follows. The creation of new forest succession patterns are the result of human control over the growing environment. Rather than proceeding at a natural pace, humans attempt to speed up the forest succession process to quickly return to a situation where harvesting is again possible. Reforestation of the disturbed area after clear-cutting also emphasizes maintaining control over the distribution and quality of forest species.

Simplification is a state that results from the forest being harvested before it reaches maturity. Logging simplifies forest ecosystems (Dudley et al 1995) by narrowing the age range of the stand and suppressing diversification through repeated harvesting, burning to remove slash, and replanting with hybrid seedlings. Simplification affects the health and productivity of the forest because simplified forests lack the variety found in older stands, including species diversity, vertical structure, and microhabitat. From an ecological standpoint, a simplified forest of a particular age has less overall bio-mass

per acre than a natural forest of the same age, but a simplified forest produces a higher volume of merchantable timber.

Scott, Mark G.
"**Forest Clearing in the Gray's River Watershed 1905-1996**"
A research paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of MASTER OF SCIENCE in GEOGRAPHY
Portland State University, 2001
http://www.markscott.biz/papers/grays/chapter1.htm

Timber Harvest Opposing View #58 - "Within this volatile atmosphere the Bush Administration presented a new proposal for fire prevention called the "Healthy Forest Initiative." The plan received wide coverage in the national media in August and September 2002 and continues to be at the center of an attempt to significantly shift public land management in the United States. At the core of the plan is an effort to create private sector incentives to promote logging/thinning projects in the national forests."

Short, Brant, Ph.D. and Dayle C. Hardy-Short Ph.D.
"**Physicians of the Forest": A Rhetorical Critique of the Bush Healthy Forest Initiative**"
Electronic Green Journal, Issue #19, December 2003
http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4288f8j5

Timber Harvest Opposing View #59 - "Logging on the National Forests provides less than 5% of the nation's timber supply, but costs the taxpayers more than 1 billion dollars in subsidies every year. Nor is logging a good job provider compared to recreation, which by Forest Service estimates provides over 30 times the economic benefits of logging. These forests are the last remnants of the virgin forests that covered the country, and now have far more value as forest ecosystems, watershed/water supply protection, and recreational assets than for logging. In fact, the justification for the Weeks Act in 1911 which established national forests in the east, was watershed protection.

(A major barrier to the Forest Service changing its ways is that these increased recreational economic benefits flow into the local economy, not to the Forest Service itself, whereas extractive uses of the national forests contribute directly to Forest Service budgets.)

"Our nation is engaged in a great debate over the real purpose of our national forests, with the weight of public opinion swinging more and more strongly toward preservation. Certainly this nation should not be subsidizing logging when it is clear that we understand so little about the functioning of these enormously complex and ancient forest ecosystems that provide millions of people with clean air and water, as well as homes for a myriad of plants and wildlife that can live nowhere else."

Sierra Club. 2005 "**Ending Commercial Logging on Public Lands**"
http://northcarolina.sierraclub.org/pisgah/conservation/ecl.html

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #60 - "Timber harvesting in British Columbia influences (a) forest hydrology; (b) fluvial geomorphology; (c) terrain stability; and (d) integrated watershed behavior. Impacts on forest hydrology are well understood and include increased average runoff, total water yield, increased storm runoff and advances in timing of floods. Stream channels and valley floors are impacted differently by fine sediment, coarse sediment and large woody debris transport. Terrain stability is influenced through gully and mass movement processes that are accelerated by timber harvesting. Impacts on integrated watershed behavior are assessed through disturbed sediment budgets and lake sediments."

Slaymaker, Olav Ph.D. "**Assessment of the Geomorphic Impacts of Forestry in British Columbia**"
AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment 29(7):381-387. 2000
http://www.bioone.org/doi/abs/10.1579/0044-7447-29.7.381

Timber Harvest Opposing View #61 - "In sum, 100 years of fire suppression and logging have created conditions that threaten central Oregon's natural resources and communities."

"Thus it is inexplicable that the solution proposed by President Bush and some members of Congress emphasizes fire suppression and commercial logging, the very practices that created today's crisis. The federal government continues to attempt to suppress over 99% of all wildland fires. The Forest Service continues to measure its success not in terms of ecosystems restored, but in fires put out. The President's Healthy Forest Initiative, as embodied in H.R. 1904, promotes commercial logging at the expense of citizen participation and oversight of the forests we own."

Stahl, Andy. "**Reducing the Threat of Catastrophic Wildfire to Central Oregon Communities and the Surrounding Environment**." Testimony before the House Committee on Resources, August 25, 2003
http://www.propertyrightsresearch.org/2004/articles6/testimony_of_andy_stahl.htm

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #62 - "Fire, just like insects and disease, are a natural and beneficial part of forest ecosystems and watersheds. Without these natural processes the forest ecosystems quickly degrade. Excessive logging removes and reduces cooling shade adding to the hotter, drier forests along with logging debris creating a more flammable forest. Current "forest management" practices, road building and development cause forest fires to rage for hundreds of miles.

The Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project said in a report to the U.S. Congress that timber harvests have increased fire severity more than any other recent human activity. Logging, especially clear cutting, can change the fire climate so that fires start more easily, spread faster, further, and burn hotter causing much more devastation than a fire ignited and burned under natural conditions. If we stop the logging and stop building fire prone developments, we minimize the loss of lives and property suffered by people in fires.

As long as the people of America let politicians, timber executives, and the Forest Service get away with it - it will not stop. Those corporations that profit will continue to lie, cheat and steal to continue to make more money from our losses. Just like big tobacco."

Strickler, Karyn and Timothy G. Hermach, "**Liar, Liar, Forests on Fire: Why Forest Management Exacerbates Loss of Lives and Property**" Published by *CommonDreams.org*, October 31, 2003
http://www.commondreams.org/scriptfiles/views03/1031-10.htm

Timber Harvest Opposing View #63 - "The agency's commercial timber program can contribute to the risk and severity of wildfire in the National Forests, yet Congress devotes nearly one-third of the Forest Service's entire budget to this wasteful program." (pg. 1)

"Do not utilize the commercial timber program to reduce the risk of fire. Commercial incentives undercut forest health objectives and can actually increase the risk of fire." (pg. 9)

"Commercial logging, especially of larger, fire-resistant trees, in the National Forests is one of several factors contributing to the risk and severity of wildfire." (pg. 19)

"Commercial logging and logging roads open the forest canopy, which can have two effects. First, it allows direct sunlight to reach the forest floor, leading to increased evaporation and drier forests.[5] As a consequence, ground fuels (grass, leaves, needles, twigs, etc.) dry out more quickly and become susceptible to fire. Second, an open canopy allows more sunlight to reach the understory trees, increasing their growth.[6] This can lead to weaker, more densely-packed forests." (pgs. 19-20)

"Congress and the Forest Service continue to rely on the commercial logging program to do something it will never accomplish – reduce fire risk. The commercial logging program is designed to provide trees to private timber companies, not to reduce the risk of fire." (pg. 20)

Taxpayers for Common Sense. "***From the Ashes:*** **Reducing the Harmful Effects and Rising Costs of Western Wildfires**"
Washington DC , Dec. 2000
http://www.ourforests.org/fact/ashes.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #64 - "Indiscriminate logging is not a viable solution to reducing wildfire risk. Logging can actually increase fire danger by leaving flammable debris on the forest floor. Loss of tree canopy lets the sun in, encouraging the growth of

brush, increases wind speed and air temperature, and decreases the humidity in the forest, making fire conditions even worse."

Thomas, Craig. **"Living with risk: Homeowners face the responsibility and challenge of developing defenses against wildfires**." *Sacramento Bee* newspaper, July 1, 2007.
http://www.sierraforestlegacy.org/NR_InTheNews/SFLIP_2007-07-01_SacramentoBee.php

---

Timber Harvest Opposing View #65 - "Timber harvest, through its effects on forest structure, local microclimate, and fuels accumulation, has increased fire severity more than any other recent human activity."(pg.62)

University of California; SNEP Science Team and Special Consultants
1996 *"**Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project*: Final Report to Congress**"
Volume 1, Chapter 4 – Fire and Fuels.
http://ceres.ca.gov/snep/pubs/web/PDF/v1_ch04.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #67 - "The development of sound forest-management policies requires that consideration be given to the economic benefits associated with competing uses of forest resources. The benefits that may be provided under different management regimes include both use values (such as those provided by timber harvesting and recreation) and passive-use (or nonuse) values, including existence value, option value and quasi-option value. Many of these benefits are not revealed in market transactions, and thus cannot be inferred from conventional data on prices and costs."

Vincent, James W. Ph.D., Daniel A. Hagen, Ph.D., Patrick G. Welle Ph.D. and Kole Swanser. 1995. ***Passive-Use Values of Public Forestlands: A Survey of the Literature.***
A study conducted on behalf of the U.S. Forest Service.
http://www.icbemp.gov/science/vincent.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #68 - "Unfortunately, there are number of massive logging proposals, disguised as hazardous fuels treatments, that have put environmentalists at odds with the Forest Service. Nearly all of these proposals focus primarily on the removal of mature and old-growth trees. These proposals continue even with overwhelming evidence that commercial logging is more of a problem than a solution. There's simply a cognitive disconnect between the Forest Service's scientists and its timber sale planners, whose budgets are dependent upon selling valuable mature trees.

Ironically, this very type of logging, experts inform us, is likely to increase, not decrease, the frequency and severity of wildland fires.

In the Forest Service's own National Fire Plan, agency scientists warned against the use of commercial logging to address fire management. The report found that 'the removal of large, merchantable trees from forests does not reduce fire risk and may, in fact, increase such risk.' "

Voss, René
"**Getting Burned by Logging**," July 2002
The Baltimore Chronicle
http://www.baltimorechronicle.com/firelies_jul02.shtml

Timber Harvest Opposing View #69 - "Another surprising finding is that mechanical fuels treatment, commonly known as logging and thinning, typically has little effect on the spread of wildfires. In fact, in some cases, it can increase wildfires' spread and severity by increasing the fine fuels on the ground (slash) and by opening the forest to greater wind and solar penetration, drying fuels faster than in unlogged forests."

Wuerthner, George. "**Logging, thinning would not curtail wildfires**"
The Eugene *Register-Guard*, December 26, 2008
http://wuerthner.blogspot.com/2008/12/logging-thinning-would-not-curtail.html

Timber Harvest Opposing View #70 - “Logging equipment compacts soils. Logging removes biomass critical to future soil productivity of the forest. Logging disturbs sensitive wildlife. Logging typically requires roads and skid trails which create chronic sources of sedimentation that degrades water quality and aquatic organism habitat. Logging roads and skid trails are also a major vector for the spread of weeds. Logging disrupts nutrient cycling and flows. Logging can alter species composition and age structure (i.e. loss of old growth). Logging can alter fire regimes. Logging can change water cycling and water balance in a drainage. The litany of negative impacts is much longer, but suffice it to say that anyone who suggests that logging is a benefit or benign is not doing a full accounting of costs.”

Those who suggest that logging “benefits” the forest ecosystem are using very narrow definitions of “benefit.” Much as some might claim that smoking helps people to lose weight and is a “benefit” of smoking.”

Wuerthner, George “**Who Will Speak For the Forests?**”
NewWest, January 27, 2009
http://www.newwest.net/topic/article/who_will_speak_for_the_forests/C564/L564/

Timber Harvest Opposing View #71 - "After logging, peak pipeflow was about 3.7 times greater than before logging."

"The use of heavy logging equipment was expected to compact the soil, reduce infiltration rates, and increase surface runoff. In addition, heavy equipment might collapse some of the subsurface pipes, increasing local pore water pressure and the chance of landslides (Sidle, 1986)."

Ziemer, Robert R. Ph.D., **"Effect of logging on subsurface pipeflow and erosion: coastal northern California, USA."** Proceedings of the Chengdu Symposium, July 1992. *IAHS Publication*. *No. 209*, 1992
http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/ziemer/Ziemer92.PDF

Timber Harvest Opposing View #72 - "As conservation-minded scientists with many years of experience in biological sciences and ecology, we are writing to bring your attention to the need to protect our National Forests. Logging our National Forests has not only degraded increasingly rare and valuable habitat, but also numerous other services such as recreation and clean water."

"Unfortunately, the past emphasis of management has been on logging and the original vision for our National Forests has failed to be fully realized. During the past several decades, our National Forests have suffered from intense commercial logging. Today almost all of our old growth forests are gone and the timber industry has turned our National Forests into a patchwork of clearcuts, logging roads, and devastated habitat."

"It is now widely recognized that commercial logging has damaged ecosystem health, clean water, and recreational opportunities-- values that are highly appreciated by the American public. The continued logging of our National Forests also wastes American tax dollars and diminishes the possibilities of future economic benefits. The Forest Service and independent economists have estimated that timber accounts for only 2.7 percent of the total values of goods and services derived from the National Forests, while recreation and fish and wildlife produce 84.6 percent."

From an April 16, 2002 letter to President Bush asking him to stop all logging in the national forests.
http://www.forestwatch.org/content.php?id=108
Note: After the link has been opened, scroll to the bottom and follow the link to "Scientist's No Logging Letter.pdf 64KB" This will show the complete letter and the signatories.

The names of the 221 Ph.D. level scientists that signed the letter are listed below:

Dr. E.O. Wilson, Ph.D.
Harvard University,
Department of Biology,
Professor

Dr. Anne Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Stanford University,
Department of Biological Sciences, Sr. Research Associate, Center for Conservation Biology

---

Dr. Peter Raven, Ph.D.
Missouri Botanical Garden,
Director, 2000 National Medal of Science winner

Dr. David R. Foster, Ph.D.
Harvard University, Director
Harvard Forest

Dr. Kenneth P. Able, Ph.D.
University at Albany, SUNY
Department of Biological Sciences, Professor

Dr. Kraig Adler, Ph.D.
Cornell University, Vice Provost for Life Sciences, Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Steven C. Anderson, Ph.D.
University of the Pacific,
Department of Biological Sciences, Professor Emeritus

Dr. William D. Anderson, Jr., Ph.D.
Grice Marine Biological Laboratory

Dr. Robert Angus, Ph.D.
University of Alabama-Birmingham, Department of Biology, Professor

---

Dr. Jonathan W. Armbruster, Ph.D.
Auburn University, Department of Biology, Assistant Professor of Biology, Curator of Fishes

---

Dr. David R. Atkinson, Ph.D.
Cornell University, Professor of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology

---

Michelle A. Baker, Ph.D.
Utah State University, Department of Biology, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. Henry L. Bart, Jr., Ph.D
Tulane University, Museum of Natural History, Director and Curator of Fishes

---

Dr. Fakhri Bazzaz, Ph.D.
Harvard University, Department of Biology, Mallinckrodt Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Donald L. Beaver, Ph.D.
Michigan State University, Department of Zoology/The Michigan State University Museum, Professor Emeritus

---

Dr. David L. Bechler, Ph.D.
Valdosta State University, Department of Biology, Department Head

---

Dr. Chris Benkman, Ph.D.
New Mexico State University, Department of Biology, Associate Professor

---

Dr. Brad Bergstrom, Ph.D.
Valdosta State University, Department of Biology, Professor

Dr. Tim M. Berra, Ph.D.
Ohio State University, Evolution, Ecology & Organismal Biology, Professor Emeritus

---

Dr. Benjamin Blount, Ph.D.
University of Georgia, Department of Anthropology, Professor

Dr. Dee Boersma, Ph.D.
University of Washington, Department of Zoology, Professor

Dr. Eric Bolen, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina-Wilmington, Department of Biology, Professor of Wildlife Ecology

---

Dr. Herb Boschung, Ph.D.
University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa, Department of Biological Sciences, Professor Emeritus

---

Dr. Richard Bradley, Ph.D.
Ohio State University, Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology, Professor

---

Dr. Greg Brown, Ph.D.
Alaska Pacific University, Department of Environmental Science, Associate Professor

---

Dr. David M. Bryant , Ph.D.
Harvard University, Department of Earth and Planetary Science, Member, Zi Sigma Pi, the Honorary Fraternity of Foresters

---

Dr. Deborah Buitron, Ph.D.
North Dakota State University, Department of Biological Sciences, Adjunct Professor
Dr. Rabel J. Burdge, Ph.D.
Western Washington University, Department of Sociology, and Environmental Studies, Professor Emeritus,

---

Dr. Nancy M. Butler, Ph.D.
Gustavus Adolphus College, Department of Biology, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. William Calder, Ph.D.
University of Arizona, Professor of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

---

Kevin Caldwell, Ph.D
Appalachian Ecological Consultants, Botanist

Dr. Todd Campbell, Ph.D.
University of Tennessee, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Post-Doctoral Research Associate
The Institute for Biological Invasions

Kai Chan, Ph.D.
Princeton University, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

---

Dr. Jiquan Chen, Ph.D.
Michigan Tech University, School of Forestry and Wood Products, Associate Professor, Landscape

Ecology & Ecosystem Science

Dr. Joel E. Cohen, Ph.D.
Rockefeller University, Professor of Populations

Cormac Collier, Ph.D.
Cape Cod National Seashore, Biological Technician

Dr. Jeff Connor, Ph.D.
Michigan State University, Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, Associate Professor, Kellogg Biological Station, Associate Editor *Evolution*

Carol Conway, Ph.D.
University of California-Davis, Department of Ecology

Dr. Joseph Cook, Ph.D.
University of Alaska, Curator of Mammals and Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Jeffery D. Corbin, Ph.D.
University of California-Berkeley, Department of Integrative Biology, Post-Doctoral Fellow/ Lecturer

---

Dr. Richard G. Coss, Ph.D.
University of California-Davis, Graduate Groups in Psychology, Ecology, and Animal Behavior Professor

---

Dr. Tom Cottrell, Ph.D.
Central Washington University, Department of Biology, Plant Ecologist

---

Dr. Tom Cottrell, Ph.D.
Central Washington University, Department of Biology, Plant Ecologist

---

Dr. Brian I. Crother, Ph.D.
Southeastern Louisiana University, Department of Biology, Associate Professor

---

Dr. Thomas W. Culliney, Ph.D.
Hawaii Department of Agriculture, population ecologist

Dr. Gretchen C. Daily, Ph.D.
Stanford University, Department of Biological Sciences, Bing Interdisciplinary Research Scientist, Editor, Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems

---

Dr. James Danoff-Burg, Ph.D.
Columbia University, Center for Environmental Research and Conservation, Associate Research Scientist

---

Dr. Margaret B. Davis, Ph.D.
University of Minnesota, Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior, Regents Professor of Ecology, retired

---

Dr. Larry Dew, Ph.D.
University of California-Davis, Department of Anthropology

Dr. Calvin B. DeWitt, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Madison Professor of Environmental Studies
Director, Au Sable Institute of Environmental Studies

Dr. Janis L. Dickinson, Ph.D.
University of California-Berkeley Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, Assistant Research Zoologist Hastings Natural History Reservation

---

Dr. C. Kenneth Dodd, Jr., Ph.D.
University of Florida Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, Courtesy Associate Professor, President, The Herpetologists' League

---

Dr. David Edds, Ph.D.
Emporia State University, Department of Biological Sciences, Professor

---

Dr. Joan Edwards, Ph.D.
Williams University, Department of Biology, Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Timothy J. Ehlinger, Ph.D
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Department of Biological Sciences, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. Paul Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Stanford University, Department of Biological Sciences, Professor of Biological Sciences

---

Dr. W. Hardy Eshbaugh, Ph.D.
Miami University, Department of Botany, Professor Emeritus

Dr. William J. Etges, Ph.D.
University of Arkansas, Department of Biological Sciences

Dr. Joseph E. Faber, Ph.D.
West Virginia University-Parkersburg, Division of

Natural Sciences, Assistant Professor

Elizabeth Fensin, Ph.D.
N.C. Division of Water Quality, Environmental Biologist

Dr. G. Edgar Folk, Ph.D.
Iowa State University, Department of Physiology, Professor of Environmental Physiology

---

Dr. Johannes Foufopoulos, Ph.D.
Princeton University, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Visiting Assistant Professor

---

Dr. ElizaBeth A. Fox, Ph.D.
Princeton University, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Lecturer

---

Patricia Gensel, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina, Professor of Biology, President Botanical Society of America

---

Dr. Cameron Ghalambor, Ph.D.
University of California-Riverside, Department of Biology

Dr. Barrie K. Gilbert, Ph.D.
Utah State University, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife-- Ecology Center, Senior Scientist

---

Dr. Douglas S. Glazier, Ph.D.
Juniata College, Department of Biology, Professor of Biology

Dr. Robert H. Gray , Ph.D.
Umatilla Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, Principal Investigator

---

Dr. Jay Greenberg, Ph.D.
University of Rochester Medical Center, Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics

---

Dr. Correigh Greene, Ph.D.
University of California-Davis, Section of Evolution and Ecology

---

Dr. Ed Grumbine, Ph.D.
University of California-Santa Cruz, Extension Sierra Institute

---

Dr. David G. Hankin, Ph.D.
Humboldt State University, Telonicher Marine Lab Professor of Fisheries Biology

---

Dr. Robert B. Hastings, Ph.D.
Southeastern Louisiana University, Department of Biology, Professor of Biological Sciences

---

Dr. Dean A. Hendrickson, Ph.D
University of Texas- Austin, Texas Natural History Collections, Texas Museum of Science and History, Curator of Ichthyology

---

Dr. Andrew Hendry , Ph.D.
University of Massachusetts-Amherst, Organismic and Evolutionary Biology Program

---

Dr. James D. Hengeveld, Ph.D.
Indiana University, Department of Biology, Assistant Professor & Lab Coordinator

---

Dr. Frank H. Heppner, Ph.D.
University of Rhode Island, Department of Biological Sciences, Professor of biological sciences

---

Dr. David M. Hillis, Ph.D.
University of Texas- Austin, Director, School of Biological Sciences

---

Dr. Mark Hixon, Ph.D.
Oregon State University, Department of Zoology

Dr. Karen Holl, Ph.D.
University of California-Santa Cruz, Department of Environmental Studies

---

Dr. Robert W Howarth, Ph.D.
Environmental Defense Oceans Program, Senior Scientist and Program Manager

---

Dr. Bruce Hungate, Ph.D.
Northern Arizona University, Department of Biological Sciences, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. Alan Hutchcroft, Ph.D.
Rockford College, Bartels Professor of Chemistry

Dr. David W. Inouye, Ph.D.
University of Maryland, Professor & Director, Graduate Program in Sustainable Development and Conservation Biology

---

Dr. Charles Jackson, Ph.D.

Dr. Dan Janzen, Ph.D

University of Pennsylvania, Professor

Dr. Robert L. Jeanne, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Entomology, Professor of Entomology and Zoology

---

Dr. Paul A. Johnsgard, Ph.D.
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Department of Biological Sciences, Foundation Professor of Biological Sciences

---

Dr. Erik S. Jules, Ph.D.
Humboldt State University, Department of Biological Sciences, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. James R. Karr, Ph.D.
University of Washington, Department of Environmental Health, Professor of Aquatic Sciences and Zoology, Adjunct Professor of Civil Engineering

---

Dr. Sylvan R. Kaufman, Ph.D.
Harvard University, Biological Labs, Postdoctoral Fellow

Dr. Sterling Keeley, Ph.D.
University of Hawaii- Manoa, Department of Botany, Professor and Chair

---

Dr. Melody J. Kemp, Ph.D.
University of Notre Dame, Department of Biological Sciences, Postdoctoral Research Associate

---

Dr. Keith T. Killingbeck, Ph.D.
Univeristy of Rhode Island, Department of Biological Sciences

---

Dr. David R. Klein, Ph.D.
University of Alaska-Fairbanks, Institute of Arctic Biology, Professor Emeritus

---

Dr. Walter Koenig, Ph.D
University of California-Berkeley, Museum of Vertebrate Zoology

---

Dr. Alan Kohn, Ph.D.
University of Washington, Department of Zoology, Professor Emeritus, Formerly President of Society for Integrative and Comparative Biology

---

Dr. Arthur H. Kopelman, Ph.D.
State University of New York, Department of Science and Mathematics, Professor of Science, President Coastal Research and Education Society of Long Island

---

Dr. Don Kroodsma, Ph.D.
University of Massachusetts, Department of Biology, Professor

---

Dr. Kenneth Krysko, Ph.D.
University of Florida, Florida Museum of Natural History, Collections Manager, Division of Herpetology

---

Bernard Kuhajda, Ph.D.
University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa, Department of Biological Sciences

---

Stephen P. Kunz , Ph.D.
Certified Senior Ecologist,Certified Wetland Scientist

Dr. Doug LaFollette, Ph.D.
Wisconsin Secretary of State

Dr. Robert O. Lawton, Ph.D.
University of Alabama-Huntsville, Department of Biological Sciences
Estella Leopold, Ph.D.
University of Washington, Department of Botany, Professor

Dr. John J. Lepri, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina, Department of Biology, Associate Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Malcolm P. Levin, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Springfield, Department of Environmental Studies, Department Chair

---

Dr. John Lichter, Ph.D.
Bowdoin College, Biology Department and Environmental Studies Program, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. William Z. Lidicker, Ph.D.
University of California, Berkeley, Professor of Integrative Biology, Emeritus

---

Dr. David R. Lighthall, Ph.D.
California Institute for Rural Studies, Executive Director

Dr. John T. Lill, Ph.D.
University of Missouri-St.Louis

Dr. Randy Linder, Ph.D.
University of Texas- Austin, School of Biology

Sciences/Section of Integrative Biology

Dr. Robin A. Matthews, Ph.D.
Western Washington University, Huxley College of Environmental Studies, Professor, Director, Institute for Watershed Studies

---

Dr. Thomas P. Maxwell, Ph.D.
University of Maryland, Institute for Ecological Economics, Professor

---

Dr. Audrey Mayer, Ph.D.
University of Cincinnati, Department of Biological Sciences

Dr. Terrence P. McGlynn, Ph.D.
University of San Diego, Assistant Professor of Biology

Dr. James B. McGraw, Ph.D.
West Virginia University, Department of Biology, Eberly Professor of Biology & Aldo Leopold Leadership Program Fellow

---

Don McKenzie, Ph.D.
University of Washington, College of Forest Resources, Research Ecologist

---

Dr. John McLaughlin, Ph.D.
Western Washington University, Huxley College of Environmental Studies,- Department of Environmental Sciences, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. David McNeely, Ph.D

Langston University, Department of Biology, Professor

Dr. Geoff Meaden, Ph.D.
Canterbury Christ Church University College, Department of GeographyMarine Fisheries GIS Unit

---

Dr. Bruce Means, Ph.D.
Florida State University, Department of Biological Sciences, Adjunct Professor of Biological Science, Executive Director Coastal Plains Institute

---

Dr. Robert J. Meese, Ph.D.
University of California, Department of Environmental Science and Policy

---

Dr. Gary K. Meffe, Ph.D.
University of Florida, Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, Adjunct Professor, Editor, *Conservation Biology*

Dr. DeForest Mellon, Ph.D.
University of Virginia, Department of Biology, Professor of Biology

---

Dr. John Miles, Ph.D.
Western Washington University, Huxley College of Environmental Studies, Professor, Director Center for Geography and Environmental Social Sciences

---

Dr. Arlee M. Montalvo, Ph.D.
University of California-Riverside, Department of Botany and Plant Sciences, Asst. Res. Plant Population Biologist & Lecturer

---

Dr. Harold Mooney , Ph.D.
Stanford University, Department of Biological Sciences, Paul S. Achilles Professor of Environmental Biology

---

Dr. Cliff Morden, Ph.D.
University of Hawaii- Manoa, Department of Botany, ProfessorCenter for Conservation Research and Training

---

Dr. Timothy C. Morton, Ph.D.
University of Chicago, Department of Biology, visiting Assistant Professor, Ecological Society of America

---

Dr. Peter B. Moyle, Ph.D.
University of California-Davis, Department of Wildlife, Fish, and Conservation Biology, Professor of Fish Biology

---

Dr. Helmut C. Mueller, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina, Department of Biology & Curriculum in Ecology, Professor Emeritus

---

Dr. Steven Mullin, Ph.D.
Eastern Illinois University, Department of Biological Sciences, Professor

---

Dave Neely, Ph.D.
University of Alabama, Biodiversity and Systematics

Dr. Richard Niesenbaum, Ph.D.
Muhlenberg College, Department of BiologyAssociate Professor of Biology, Donald and Anne

Shire Distinguished Teaching Professor

Dr. Elliott A. Norse, Ph.D.
President, Marine Conservation Biology Institute, Author: *Ancient Forests of the Pacific Northwest*

Dr. M. Philip Nott, Ph.D.
The Institute for Bird Populations

Dr. Gary Nuechterlein, Ph.D.
North Dakota State University, Department of Biological Sciences, Professor

---

Dr. Philip Nyhus, Ph.D.
Franklin & Marshall College, Department of Geosciences, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. Dennis Ojima, Ph.D.
Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University, Senior Research Scientist, Aldo Leopold Leadership Fellow

---

Dr. Gordon H. Orians, Ph.D.
University of Washington, Professor Emeritus of Zoology

Dr. Michael Ort, Ph.D.
University of Northern Arizona, Department of Geology, Associate ProfessorCenter for Environmental Sciences and Education

---

Dr. Richard S. Ostfeld, Ph.D.
Institute of Ecosystem Studies

Dr. Ken Parejko, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin, Department of Biology, Associate Professor

---

Dr. Dennis Paulson, Ph.D.
University of Puget Sound, Slater Museum of Natural History, Director

---

Dr. Ann Phillippi, Ph.D.

Dr. Stuart Pimm, Ph.D.
Columbia University, Center for Environmental Research and Conservation, Professor of Conservation Biology

---

Dr. Mary V. Price, Ph.D.
University of California-Riverside, Department of Biology, Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Mark Pyron, Ph.D.
Ball State University, Department of Biology, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. Peter A. Quinby , Ph.D.
Paul Smith's College, Natural Resources, Science and Liberal Arts, Assistant Dean and Associate Professor

---

Dr. John T. Ratti, Ph.D.
University of Idaho- Moscow, Department of Fish and Wildlife

Dr. Stuart Reichler, Ph.D.
University of Texas- Austin, School of Biology Sciences

Dr. Janita Rice, Ph.D.
California State University

Dr. Carol Riley, Ph.D.

Dr. Caroljane B. Robertson, Ph.D.

Dr. George Robinson, Ph.D.
State University of New York at Albany, Department of Biological Sciences, Associate Professor

---

Joe Rocchio, Ph.D.
Colorado Natural Heritage Program, Wetland Ecologist

Dr. Charles Romesburg, Ph.D.
Utah State University, Department of Forest Resources, Professor

---

Dr. Thomas Rooney, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Botany

Dr. Barry Rosenbaum, Ph.D.
University of Colorado, Research Associate, Institute of Arctic and Alpine Research

---

Dr. Scott D. Russell, Ph.D.
University of Oklahoma, George Lynn Cross Research Professor of Botany, Director, Samuel Roberts Noble Electron Microscopy Laboratory

---

Dr. John M. Rybczyk, Ph.D.
Western Washington University, Huxley College of Environmental Studies, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. Karin Sable, Ph.D.
University of Puget Sound, Department of Economics

Dr. Edward Saiff, Ph.D.
Ramapo College of New Jersey, Department of

Biology, Professor of Biology, Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science

---

Dr. Alan H. Savitzky, Ph.D.
Old Dominion University, Associate Professor of Biological Sciences
Dr. John O. Sawyer, Ph.D.
Humboldt State University, Emeritus Professor of Botany

Dr. William H. Schlesinger, Ph.D.
Duke University, Dean, Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences, James B. Duke Professor of Biogeochemistry

---

Dr. Stephen H. Schneider, Ph.D
Stanford University, Department of Biological Sciences

Dr. Peter Schulze, Ph.D.
Austin College, Associate Professor of Biology, Director, Center for Environmental Studies

---

Burton Shank, Ph.D.
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation, AssociationResearch Biologist

---

Dr. Sharron K. Sherrod, Ph.D.
University of Denver, Department of Biology, Professor

Dr. Fraser Shilling, Ph.D.
University of California-Davis, Section of Microbial and Cellular Biology, Chair Committee on Conservation, Society for Integrative andComparative Biology

---

Erin A. Shope, Ph.D.
Brevard University, Environmental Educator

Dr. Clifford Slayman, Ph.D.
Yale School of Medicine Cellular and Molecular Physiology, Professor of Physiology

---

Dr. Christoper C. Smith, Ph.D.
Kansas State University, Division of Biology

Dr. Bradley F. Smith, Ph.D.
Western Washington University, Huxley College of Environmental Studies, Dean

---

Dr. Youngsinn Sohn, Ph.D.
University of Maryland-Baltimore, Geography & Environmental Systems, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. John Soluri, Ph.D.
Carnegie Mellon University, Department of History, Assistant Professor of History and Policy

---

Dr. Stefan Sommer, Ph.D.
Idaho State University, Department of Biological Sciences, Research Assistant, Professor, Director Natural Heritage Center

---

Dr. Lisa G. Sorenson, Ph.D.
Union of Concerned Scientists, Global Environment Program, Adjunct Research Assistant Professor- Biology Department, BostonUniversity

---

Dr. Michael Soule, Ph.D.
Wildlands Project

Dr. Larry T. Spencer, Ph.D.
Plymouth State College, Professor of Biology

Dr. Timothy P. Spira, Ph.D.
Clemson University, Department of Biological Sciences, Associate Professor

---

Dr. Alan Springer, Ph.D.
University of Alaska-Fairbanks, Institute of Marine Science, Professor

---

Dr. Robert D. Stevenson, Ph.D.
University of Massachusetts-Boston, Department of Biology, Associate Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Glen R. Stewart, Ph.D.
California State Polytechnic University- Pomona, Department of Biological Sciences, Professor of Zoology

---

Dr. Craig Stockwell, Ph.D.
North Dakota State University, Department of Zoology, Assistant Professor

---

Dr. Phillip K. Stoddard, Ph.D.
Florida International University, Department of Biological Sciences

---

Dr. Philip C. Stouffer, Ph.D.
Southeastern Louisiana University, Department of Biological Sciences, Associate Professor

---

Dr. Boyd R. Strain, Ph.D.
Duke University, Department of Biological Sciences, Professor Emeritus

---

Dr. Michael C. Swift, Ph.D.
St. Olaf College, Department of Biology, Department of Biology- University of Virginia, sabbatical

---

Dr. Douglas W. Tallamy, Ph.D.
University of Delaware, Department of Entomology and Applied Ecology, Professor

---

Dr. Eric J. Taylor, Ph.D
Fish and Wildlife Biologist

Dr. John Terborgh, Ph.D.
Duke University, Center for Tropical Conservation, James B Duke Professor

---

Dr. Andrea S. Thorpe, Ph.D.
University of Montana, Division of Biological Sciences

Dr. Harry M. Tiebout, Ph.D.
West Chester University, Department of Biology

Dr. Gordon Ultsch, Ph.D.
University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa, Department of Biological Sciences

---

Dr. Loraine Utter Kohorn, Ph.D.
Duke University, Department of Biology/Nicholas School of the Environment, Visiting Assistant Professor

---

Dr. Daniel M Vernon, Ph.D.
Whitman University, Department of Biology

Dr. Richard A. Wahle, Ph.D.
Bigelow Laboratory for Ocean Sciences, Research Scientist

Dr. David B. Wake, Ph.D.
University of California, Professor of Integrative Biology, Curator, Museum of Vertebrate Zoology

---

Dr. Skip Walker, Ph.D.
University of Alaska-Fairbanks, Institute of Arctic Biology

Dr. Lawernce R. Walker, Ph.D.
University of Nevada- Las Vegas, Department of Biology, Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Diana H. Wall, Ph.D.
Colorado State University, College of natural Resources, Professor, Director, Natural Resources Ecological Laboratory

---

Dr. Donald M. Waller, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Botany, Editor, *Evolution*

Dr. David O. Wallin, Ph.D.
Western Washington University, Huxley College of Environmental Studies-Department of Environmental Sciences, Associate Professor

---

Dr. Glen Walsberg, Ph.D.
Arizona State University
Professor of Biology
President, Cooper Ornithological Society

Dr. Nickolas M. Waser, Ph.D.
University of California-Riverside, Department of Biology, Professor of Biology, President, Rocky Mountain Biological Laboratory

---

Dr. Judith S. Weis, Ph.D.
Rutgers University, Department of Biological Sciences, Professor of Biology, Past President American Institute of Biological Sciences

---

Dr. John F. Weishampel, Ph.D.
University of Central Florida, Department of Biology

Dr. Gregory Welch, Ph.D.
University of Maine, Professor Darling Marine Center

Dr. Robert G. Wetzel, Ph.D.
University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa, Department of Biological Sciences, Bishop Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Peter S. White, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Department of Biology, Professor, Director North Carolina Botanical Garden

---

Dr. Bill Willers, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, Department of Biology, Emeritus Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Joe Williams, Ph.D.
Colorado State University, Department of EPO Biology

Dr. Ernest J. Willoughby, Ph.D.

St. Mary's College of Maryland, Department of Biology, Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Michael Windelspecht, Ph.D.
Appalachian State University, Department of Biology, Assistant Professor of Biology

---

Dr. Marti Witter, Ph.D.

Dr. Helen Young, Ph.D.
Middlebury College, Department of Biology Professor

Dr. Joy B. Zedler, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Botany and Arboretum, Aldo Leopold Professor of Restoration Ecology

---

Dr. Marion Klaus, Ph.D.
Sheridan College

Comment: How will the Responsible Official justify ignoring the statements of 221 unbiased, highly educated biological scientists who point out the natural resource degradation resulting from commercial timber sales? Why does the Responsible Official follow the advice of a handful of foresters and silviculturists whose job and salary depends on selling timber, and simultaneously reject the wisdom of 221 unbiased, independent scientists.

What's wrong here?

Timber Harvest Opposing View #73 - "Recently, so called "salvage" logging has increased on national forests in response to a timber industry invented "forest health crisis" which points the finger at normal forest processes of fire, fungi, bacteria, insects and other diseases. In fact the crisis in the national forests is habitat destruction caused by too much clearcutting.

My long-term studies of forest diseases in Idaho show the loss by disease and insect activity in all age classes of forests to be less than or slightly more than 1 percent per year over the past thirty-eight years. These findings are consistent with Forest Service national level data.

Forests are structured systems of many life forms interacting in intricate ways and disturbances are essential to their functioning. It's not fire disease fungi bacteria and insects that are threatening the well being of forests. Disease, fire, windthrow, and other disturbances are a natural part of the forest ecosystem and assist in dynamic processes such as succession that are essential to long term ecosystem maintenance. The real threat facing forests are excessive logging, clearcutting and roadbuilding that homogenize and destroy soil, watersheds and biodiversity of native forests."

Partridge, Arthur Ph.D., Statement at a Press Conference with Senator Robert Torricelli about S. 977 and HR 1376), the Act to Save America's Forests
April 28, 1998, U.S. Capitol
http://www.saveamericasforests.org/news/ScientistsStatement.htm

Timber Harvest Opposing View #74 – "In our overview of the impacts of forest management activities on soil erosion and productivity, we show that erosion alone is seldom the cause of greatly reduced site productivity. However, erosion, in combination with other site factors, works to degrade productivity on the scale of decades and centuries. Extreme disturbances, such as wildfire or tractor logging, cause the loss of nutrients, mycorrhizae, and organic matter. These combined losses reduce long-term site productivity and may lead to sustained periods of extended erosion that could exacerbate degradation.

Managers should be concerned with harvesting impacts, site preparation disturbances, amount of tree that is removed, and the accumulation of fuel from fire suppression. On erosion-sensitive sites, we need to carefully evaluate such management factors."

Elliot, W.J.; Page-Dumroese, D.; Robichaud, P.R. 1999. *The effects of forest management on erosion and soil productivity.* **Proceedings of the Symposium on Soil Quality and Erosion Interaction,** Keystone, CO, July 7, 1996. Ankeney, IA: Soil and Water Conservation Society. 16 p.
http://forest.moscowfsl.wsu.edu/smp/docs/docs/Elliot_1-57444-100-0.html

Timber Harvest Opposing View #75 - "Logging often destroys natural habitats, resulting in the loss of biodiversity and sometimes leading to the local, and possibly global, extinction of species. Although estimates of the rates of loss vary, few deny the reality of the current losses of both flora and fauna.[177] "

According to a joint report by the Worldwide Fund for Nature and the Sarawak Forest Department, "*Logging causes immediate forest disturbances, long-term habitat changes (e.g. damage to food trees and salt-licks), increased hunting by timber company workers and availability of logging roads as hunting routes. The destruction of wildlife from habitat loss must be recognised to be on an enormous scale*".[178] In Central Africa, the opening-up of the forest by logging facilitates the illegal hunting of wildlife, including protected species such as primates, and is leading to a decline in wildlife populations.[179] Deterioration in water quality has caused a decline in fish stocks and has affected

aquatic biological diversity because indigenous animals and plant life are highly vulnerable to oxygen depletion, suspended particulate matter and a lack of light.[180]

Even so called selective logging severely affects the complex and rich biodiversity of forests through excessive damage to residual stands, destruction of other plant and tree species and the creaming-off of species which are the most valuable for timber. An FAO study in Malaysia has shown that as much as 50% of the standing forest may be damaged and the surface soil destroyed when up to 30% of the ground surface is exposed. During silvicultural treatment in logging operations in Sarawak, so-called uneconomic forest species are deliberately poisoned. This reduces the complexity and species diversity of the tropical forests to only 10% of the original condition, resulting in the systematic elimination of tree genetic resources and contamination of the environment.[181] According to the IUCN the most frequently recorded of all threats to globally endangered tree species is 'felling'.[182] “

Forests Monitor, Environmental Impacts of Logging, 2006 (with photos)
http://www.forestsmonitor.org/en/reports/550066/550083

Timber Harvest Opposing View #76 - Major report findings:

1) If we ended the timber sales program on national forests and redirected the logging subsidies we could provide over $30,000 for each public lands timber worker for retraining or ecological restoration work - - and still have over $800 million left over for taxpayer savings in the first year alone.

2) We don’t need to log national forests for our timber supply, given the fact that the timber cut annually from national forests nationwide now comprises only 3.3% of this nation’s total annual wood consumption, and less than 4% of the sawtimber used for construction.

3) Logging on national forests INCREASES the risk of forest fires more than any other human activity.

4) A bipartisan nationwide poll conducted in 1998 found that 69% of Americans now oppose allowing timber companies to log our national forests.

Hansen, Chad, **Ending Timber Sales on National Forests: THE FACTS (FY ’97)**
Published in the *Earth Island Journal*, 1999
http://www.johnmuirproject.org/pdf/Fy-1997-Economic-Report-Ending-Timber-Sales.pdf

Timber Harvest Opposing View #77 – "However, I believe that their support for logging represents a failure to challenge many of the flawed assumptions that are guiding federal logging programs and in some cases even repeating many of the same pejorative language helps to undermine in the long term conservation efforts. After all if the public believes our forests are sick and unhealthy; that logging will cure them; that logging will preclude wildfires and eliminate beetle kill, and that rural economies are dependent on public lands logging to survive, than they are, in my view, contributing to the wrong message."

"There may be legitimate rationales for logging, but it's not the one usually given for logging public forests today. Indeed, the major justifications given for logging public lands is typically some social or ecological benefit—to reduce fires, clean up bug killed trees, fix watersheds, restore forest health or provide for "economic stability" to rural communities. In far too many cases, all of these are just cover to hide the main reason for logging—to maintain the local timber industry at the expense of our forest's ecological integrity and taxpayer dollars."

WUERTHNER, GEORGE, "Why are Conservation Groups Advocating Logging Public Forests?" Published by *Counterpunch*, September 27, 2012
http://www.counterpunch.org/2012/09/27/why-are-conservation-groups-advocating-logging-public-forests/

Timber Harvest Opposing View #78 – "Because of the current government shutdown, the public is being kept out of all National Parks and many other federal lands. But ironically, oil, mineral, and timber companies are still allowed to drill, mine, and log on federal lands while the shutdown is going on. Officials in the US Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture, which oversee National Park and National Forest lands respectively, have given us an unusually clear glimpse of where their priorities lie. Federal lands are supposed to be managed for the benefit of the American people, and resource extraction shouldn't be going on while the public is barred from our National Parks.

During the shutdown, which was caused because Congress has been unable to pass a budget, almost all “nonessential” federal government services are temporarily unavailable. The fact that the Departments of Interior and Agriculture have apparently found the resources to keep public lands open to drilling and logging, but can’t keep National Parks and other recreational areas open, shows resource extraction in being prioritized over public access to our lands. It’s time for this to change.”

“Stop Drilling and Logging on Federal Lands While the Public is Kept Out”
A petition targeted for Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewel and Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack
Posted at FORCECHANGE.COM, 2013
http://forcechange.com/86223/stop-drilling-and-logging-on-federal-lands-while-the-public-is-kept-out/

Timber Harvest Opposing View #79 – “"We tried for the past 18-months to work with Supervisor Bull to implement an effective community fuel reduction project up the East Fork. Our proposal - which was favored by 98% of the 13,000 public comments received on this project would have reduced fuels on 1,600 acres of national forest land, pumped $1 million into the local economy and provided 45 local jobs. Unfortunately, this common sense plan was rejected by Supervisor Bull," stated Koehler.”

“ "The attempt by Supervisor Bull to cover-up public knowledge of excessive soil damage in the project area by altering the best-available scientific data and by purging project file documents related to soils is a blatant attempt to white-wash this damaging proposal and cannot go unchallenged," explained Campbell.”

“The East Fork project area is still recovering from historic Forest Service mismanagement including clearcutting, terracing and excessive roadbuilding. 33% of the entire analysis area has already been logged. The analysis area averages 5.2 miles of road per square mile, not including jammer roads. These roads contribute 151.2 tons of sediment per year to streams within the project area. The East Fork, running through the middle of the project area, is officially classified as an impaired stream because its excessive sediment load has compromised its ecological integrity. Several watersheds already exceed established thresholds for clearcutting, which threatens stream channel stability with increased runoff.”

Conservation Groups Look to Hold Forest Service Accountable for Middle East Fork Logging Plan

Published by *Lowbagger*, April 25, 2006
http://www.lowbagger.org/mideast.html

Note: In April of 2009, the Forest Service's Northern Region rewarded Supervisor Bull for his mismanagement of public land with a promotion to the Director of Recreation.

Timber Harvest Opposing View #80 – "Logging on national forest land creates more economic harm than good, according to a recent study by the National Forest Protection Alliance and the Forest Conservation Council.

The 75-page report, three years in the making, notes there are dramatic economic and social losses when forests are logged under the U.S. Forest Service's timber-sale program.

The report, "The Economic Case Against Logging National Forests," states that national forest lands are far more valuable to rural communities when trees are left standing, and that the federal logging program creates billions of dollars in unaccounted costs for communities, businesses, and individuals. This expense comes in addition to timber industry subsidies, which cost American taxpayers approximately $1.2 billion a year."

"Talberth said both reports lend support to current efforts in Congress to end the federal timber-sale program. Introduced by Rep. Cynthia McKinney (D-Georgia) in April 1999, the National Forest Protection and Restoration Act (H.R. 1396) would put an end the federal timber-sale program."

Higgins, Margot, "National forest logging is bad business, study says"
Posted on CNN.com-Nature, March 16, 2000
http://edition.cnn.com/2000/NATURE/03/16/forest.logging.enn/index.html

---

… Yes, there are hundreds more statements like these that the USFS does not want its line-officers to see. Please remove yourself from the denial mode.

In a few decades the truth will be revealed about how the USFS taught its line-officers to deceive the American public with blatant lies intended to make them believe logging will benefit and restore the forest.

Will you be proud when your great, great, great grandchildren learn that you were at the epicenter of the systematic plundering of our precious undeveloped public land for short-term corporate profit? Once again, in 2 generations the population of the United States will more

than double to 650 million people. Where will the kids go for silence and solitude?

To preserve this refuge for humanity the USFS should currently be spending every penny to maintain the precious, undeveloped wildness of the public land they control.

How will you sleep knowing you are partially responsible for the plunder?

A 70 year-old plantation mimicking private industrial tree farm conditions is not a functioning, wild forest.

Shame on You.